

ARTICLE 10
 CHITRE 10

WASHINGTON TIMES
 4 April 1986

JOHN LOFTON

Dodd's self-fulfilling prophecies

Ladies and gentlemen, may I present, please, the winner of this year's "Annual Jeane Dixon Gift of Self-Fulfilling Prophecy Award": Sen. Christopher Dodd, Democrat of Connecticut.

Appearing last week on CBS's late-night "Nightwatch" program to debate the question of military aid for the freedom fighters who are battling the Communist Sandinistas, Mr. Dodd pooh-poohed the Sandinista invasion of Honduras. Dusting off his crystal ball — and admitting that he is "a minority within a minority" who is *not* among those Democrats who want to find a way to support the "contras" — Mr. Dodd pointed out, proudly, that three years ago he said there would be an "expanded conflict" in Central America. This has now happened and this will continue, he said.

Now, of all the anti-military-aid-to-the-"contras" arguments, this is one of the goofiest. And this argument is, as the title of Mr. Dodd's award indicates, a self-fulfilling prophecy. Think about it for just a minute, something Mr. Dodd obviously hasn't done.

Of course the conflict involving the Communist Sandinistas has expanded. Why? Because people like Mr. Dodd have repeatedly voted against the military aid which would have given the "contras" at least the possibility of restricting Sandinista aggression to the territory within Nicaragua's own borders.

But credit must be given where credit is due. When it comes to selling out those who want to fight Communism, Mr. Christopher Dodd is a master of the stab-in-the-back.

In February of 1975, President Gerald Ford was asking for \$222 million in military aid to allow those who wanted to fight the Communists to defend themselves in Cambodia. In a message to Congress, Mr. Ford noted: "If additional military assistance is withheld or delayed, the government forces will be forced, within weeks, to surrender to the insurgents. . . . This is a moral question

that must be faced squarely. Are we to deliberately abandon a small country in the midst of a life-and-death struggle? Is the United States, which so far has consistently stood by its friends through the most difficult of times, now to condemn, in effect, a small Asian nation totally dependent upon us?"

Well, Mr. Dodd, who was a member of the House at this time, *did* face this question squarely. And what he said was unequivocal and it was: cut off military aid to the anti-Communist Cambodians and cut it off now. In a statement in the *Congressional Record* dated March 12, 1975, Mr. Dodd declared:

"The time has come when the United States must admit that it has done all it possibly could to keep the regime of President Lon Nol in power in Cambodia. It no longer matters that we should have withdrawn our support sooner; what matters is that we end military aid to Cambodia now. . . .

"In ending military aid, the United States should make certain that the transition of government take place in an orderly and humane manner. We should continue our efforts to supply the Cambodian people with food and humanitarian aid."

Sound familiar?

And, in conclusion, Mr. Dodd observed, in one of the most tragically mistaken predictions ever made by an American politician, that: "The greatest gift our country can give to the Cambodian people is not guns but peace. *And the best way to accomplish that goal is by ending military aid now.*" (Emphasis mine.)

Well, we all know what happened when the United States ended its military aid to those desiring to fight the Communists in Cambodia. The result was neither "peace" nor a transition of government "in an orderly and humane manner." No way. What happened was one of the most inhumane occurrences in the recorded history of the world: the Communist Khmer Rouge engaged in genocide and murdered millions of their fellow Cambodians.

And in that same year of 1975, Mr. Dodd took a similar stance against those trying to fight Communism in Angola. When the United States attempted to aid those freedom fighters in Angola who were fighting the Soviets and the Cubans, Mr. Dodd — unable to see any differences between the Communists and the *anti*-Communists — denounced the "blatant intrusion" of the Ford administration, the Soviets, the South Africans, and the Cubans into the domestic affairs of Angola.

But Mr. Dodd denied being soft on Communism. While he could not excuse U.S. covert activities in Angola, Mr. Dodd said, he was not suggesting that we should sit back and acquiesce to "the politics of penetration" being conducted by the Soviets and the Cubans, among others.

No sireee! Mr. Dodd said there should be "a forceful response" from the United States in "the most direct of fashions."

The United States, said Mr. Dodd, should advocate "an effective and thorough solution to this problem." Like what? Well, Mr. Dodd said that he would urge his colleagues in the House to launch "a full congressional investigation of the Angolan situation and to adopt a policy whose aim is the total disengagement of all the outside parties involved."

Wow. A real forceful response, right?

And Mr. Dodd has been similarly "forceful" in his suggestions as to how we ought to deal with the Communist Sandinistas. He thinks we ought to talk with them. That's right. On the "Nightwatch" program, he said that "the problem" regarding the Sandinista Communists is that there is "no sense whatsoever" in the Senate that the Reagan administration is "really serious" about negotiating with the Communist Sandinistas.

But when did Mr. Dodd acquire a faith in the trustworthiness of Communists? In 1975, when President Ford signed the Helsinki agreement which guaranteed Soviet control over its Eastern European puppet states, Mr. Dodd took to the House floor to say that he was "skeptical" about this agreement because "signatures on a piece of paper in Helsinki" could not guarantee "true freedom of ideas and movement" in Eastern Europe.

Well, I agree. The Helsinki agreement was a turkey. And Mr. Dodd was correct to say, as he did, that it was a "cruel delusion" for anyone to believe that this agreement with the Soviets would mean progress in human rights.

But the same thing is true now regarding the Communist Sandinistas. It is also a "cruel delusion" to believe that "signatures on a piece of paper" signed in Managua or Washington, D.C., are going to resolve *this* conflict.

The Communist Sandinistas seized power by using military force. And the only way things will get better in Nicaragua is by using military force to get rid of the Communist Sandinistas.

John Lofton is a staff columnist for The Washington Times.
